

## **SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

### **M.1. EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990) (Reference FAR 52.217-5)**

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interest, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(End of Provision)

### **M.2. EVALUATION FACTORS**

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the factors, sub-factors, and sub-sub-factors listed below. All factors, sub-factors, and sub-sub-factors are of equal importance.

#### **(A) Technical Quality.**

- (1) Technical Approach
- (2) Technical Methodology

#### **(B) Management Quality.**

- (1) Program Management Plan
  - a. Management/Supervisory Functional Responsibilities
  - b. Key Personnel Resume Quality
  - c. Transitioning Approach and Plan
- (2) Resource Management Plan
  - a. Organizational Staffing and Reporting
  - b. Human Resource Management
  - c. Financial Resource Management
- (3) Quality Control Plan
  - a. Inspection System
  - b. Identifying and Correcting Deficiencies
  - c. Documentation and Reports
- (4) Subcontracting Plan
- (5) Government-Furnished Property Plan
- (6) Emergency Situations and Contingency Operations Support Plan

#### **(C) Past and Present Performance.**

- (1) Relevant Government Contract Experience
- (2) Relevant Civilian Contract Experience
- (3) Key Personnel Relevant Government & Civilian Contract Experience
- (4) Past and Present Subcontract Management

**Price Proposal.** The Price Proposal will be evaluated using cost and price analysis techniques. The total proposed price will be evaluated using the sub-factors below but will not be assigned an adjectival rating. The following sub-factors will be used in the total price proposal evaluation:

- (1) Cost and Price Reasonableness
- (2) Cost and Price Realism
- (3) Cost and Price Accuracy
- (4) Cost and Price Completeness

### **M.3. BASIS FOR EVALUATION**

A. The Government will evaluate each proposal under formal source selection procedures. The Government will evaluate each offeror's Technical Quality Proposal, Management Quality Proposal, and Past & Present Performance Proposal. Proposals will be evaluated using the factors, sub-factors, and sub-sub-factors in paragraph M.2 (A-C above) to determine technical acceptability. The Price Proposal will be evaluated to determine the lowest probable total cost, based upon reasonableness, realism, accuracy, and completeness. The evaluation process is outlined below.

1) Each offeror's Technical Quality Proposal, Management Quality Proposal, and Past & Present Performance Proposal will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation factors, sub-factors, and sub-sub-factors identified in paragraph M.2 (A through C above). Each of the evaluation factors, sub-factors, and sub-sub-factors will receive an adjectival rating of Acceptable, Marginal, or Unacceptable. These adjectival ratings are defined as follows:

**Acceptable** To receive this rating, offerors must present a proposal that clearly and comprehensively addresses each of the services in each of the functional areas (Sections) of the Performance Requirements Document in the solicitation by Section, paragraph number, sub-paragraph number, and sub-sub-paragraph number, as applicable. The offeror must provide sufficient details for the Government to determine whether the proposal satisfactorily meets the minimum requirements of the Performance Requirements Document and solicitation. The proposal must clearly show that the offeror fully understands and can perform the requirements as delineated in its proposal for the total proposed price indicated in its proposal, with the manning identified for each functional Section, paragraph, sub-paragraph, and sub-sub-paragraph, as applicable. The manning charts for each functional area must identify the manning by Section, paragraph, sub-paragraph, and sub-sub-paragraph, as applicable. Offerors must address with substantial specificity the services identified in Technical Exhibit 1 (Service Performance Summary) located in each Section of the Performance Requirements Document. All Service Performance Summary items are considered critical to successful performance of the contract. With respect to the Quality Control, each offeror shall address the specific methodology it intends to employ to ensure quality services are furnished the Government for the services outlined in Technical Exhibit 7 (Performance Summary of Quality Control Standards).

**Marginal** To receive this rating, the offeror's approach or plan has been presented with minor omissions, weaknesses and/or a misunderstanding of the requirements in the RFP that could be corrected or expanded without a complete revision of the proposal. There is reasonable risk of a proposal with this rating meeting requirements of the PRD and solicitation. However, through exchanges, a proposal with this rating may achieve the acceptable rating level.

**Unacceptable** An unacceptable rating will be assessed any offeror that presents a proposal that meets the following:

- A proposal that fails to clearly and comprehensively address each of the services in each of the functional areas of the Performance Requirements Document in the solicitation by Section, paragraph number, sub-paragraph number, and sub-sub-paragraph number, as applicable.
- A proposal that fails to provide sufficient details for the Government to determine whether the proposal satisfactorily meets the minimum requirements of the Performance Requirements Document and solicitation in addressing the functional area services.

- A proposal that fails to clearly show that the offeror fully understands and can perform the requirements as delineated in its proposal for the total proposed price indicated in its proposal.
- A proposal that fails to submit manning charts that identify and key the manning to each PRD functional Section, paragraph, sub-paragraph, and sub-sub-paragraph, as applicable.
- A proposal that fails to address with substantial specificity the services identified in Technical Exhibit 1 (Service Performance Summary) located in each Section of the Performance Requirements Document. All Service Performance Summary items are considered critical to successful performance of the contract.
- A proposal that fails to address in its Quality Control Plan, the specific methodology it shall employ to ensure quality services are furnished the Government for the services outlined in the PRD with emphasis on the services identified in Technical Exhibit 7 (Performance Summary of Quality Control Standards).
- **A proposal that is unreasonable, unrealistic, grossly inaccurate, and negligently incomplete in terms of cost and price.**
- **A proposal with a rating of no confidence/high risk.**

If after the initial evaluation of offers the contracting officer does not deem it necessary to conduct exchanges with offerors the lowest priced offeror who has received an adjectival rating of Acceptable on all evaluation factors, sub-factors, and sub-sub-factors will be selected to compete against the Government MEO in the cost comparison.

If after the initial evaluation of offers the contracting officer deems it necessary to conduct exchanges with offerors, the contracting officer may identify a “competitive range” consisting of the number of proposals deemed necessary by the contracting officer in order to conduct an efficient competition. A proposal that receives an initial evaluation of Unacceptable on any factor, sub-factor, or sub-sub-factor may be considered ineligible for the competitive range if one is established. A proposal that receives an initial evaluation of Acceptable on all factors, sub-factors, and sub-sub-factors will be included in the competitive range if one is established. A proposal that receives an initial evaluation consisting of Marginal on one or more factors, sub-factors, or sub-sub-factors may be included in the competitive range, if one is established, at the discretion of the contracting officer.

The evaluation factors, sub-factors, and sub-sub-factors will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria explained below. With respect to the services in the PRD, a PRD Services Crosswalk Checklist is included at **Attachment 11** to aid offerors in ensuring that each service in each functional area is addressed in the proposal, as required.

**(a) Technical Quality.** Technical Quality will consist of the two sub-factors below. The Government will assess each offeror’s Technical Quality Proposal to ensure it meets the requirements and intent of the PRD as a whole. The technical quality proposal shall comprehensively address each service in each functional area (Section) of the PRD in the solicitation in sequential order. The technical quality proposal shall address the services by Section, paragraph number, subparagraph number, and sub-subparagraph number, as applicable, and provide sufficient details for the government to determine whether the proposal satisfactorily meets the requirements of the Performance Requirements document and solicitation. The proposal shall also provide a narrative and supporting data with the sections organized separately so that the evaluation sub-factors listed below are included. Additionally, each factor, sub-factor, and sub-sub-factor will receive a subjective rating based on confidence and risk. *Proposal Confidence* represents the Government evaluation team’s judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the

offeror's demonstrated technical proposal. *Proposal Risk* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of an offeror's potential for **unsuccessful** contract performance.

(1) **Technical Approach (sub-factor 1)** – The Government will assess each offeror's ability to meet the technical requirements necessary for successful performance of the requirements of the PRD and solicitation. Each offeror's technical approach will be evaluated on the offeror's demonstration of how its application of personnel, equipment, and other resources will be utilized to accomplish each service required in each functional area (Section) of the Performance Requirements Document in sequential order. The offeror will be evaluated on the explanation of its approach and its demonstration of how each service within each of the functional areas (Sections) of the Performance Requirements Document will be accomplished. Items to be considered shall include, but not be limited to, technical procedures, processes, control methods, and new or innovative approaches. Offerors should exercise particular care in addressing with substantial specificity the services identified in Technical Exhibit 1 (Service Performance Summary) located in each Section of the Performance Requirements Document. With respect to the Quality Control, each offeror shall address the specific methodology it intends to employ to ensure quality services are furnished the Government for the services outlined in Technical Exhibit 7 (Performance Summary of Quality Control Standards). Additionally, each offeror's technical approach will be evaluated on its description of the proposed use of subcontractors in performing services, subcontract management, autonomy, and the offeror's oversight process. The evaluation will assess the **manning charts relative to each functional area of the PRD**. The manning charts for each functional area must identify the manning by Section, paragraph, sub-paragraph, and sub-sub-paragraph, as applicable. **An example of the manning chart is located at Attachment 9**. Additionally, each factor, sub-factor, and sub-sub-factor will receive a subjective rating based on confidence and risk. *Proposal Confidence* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated technical proposal. *Proposal Risk* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of an offeror's potential for **unsuccessful** contract performance.

(2) **Technical Methodology (Sub-factor 2)** – The Government will assess the offeror's ability and methodology to meet the technical requirements necessary to ensure successful performance of the requirements of the PRD and solicitation. Technical methodology is the planning, organizing and controlling necessary to optimize responsiveness, timeliness, efficiency, and effectiveness of services rendered and encompasses the recognition of the full scope of services and their interrelationships. Offerors will be evaluated on their ability to provide a practical, straightforward, specific, concise, and complete overview of the methods to be employed to accomplish the technical requirements of functional areas (Sections) of the Performance Requirements Document outlined in the technical approach. Additionally, each factor, sub-factor, and sub-sub-factor will receive a subjective rating based on confidence and risk. *Proposal Confidence* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated technical proposal. *Proposal Risk* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of an offeror's potential for **unsuccessful** contract performance.

(b) **Management Quality** – Management Quality will consist of the six sub-factors below. The Government will assess the offeror's Management Quality Proposal to ensure it meets the requirements and intent of the PRD as a whole. Additionally, each factor, sub-factor, and sub-sub-factor will receive a subjective rating based on confidence and risk. *Proposal Confidence* represents the Government evaluation Team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated Management Quality

Proposal. *Proposal Risk* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of an offeror's potential for unsuccessful contract performance.

(1) Program Management (Sub-factor 1) - The Government will assess the offeror's ability to meet overall program management requirements necessary to ensure successful performance of the requirements of the PRD and solicitation. The evaluation will consider the adequacy and quality of the levels of key management and supervision relating to each Section of the PRD to include assignment of functional responsibilities for supervision, applicable procedures, and reporting relationships. The manning charts shall identify the proposed management staff and relate the staff to the functional areas of the PRD. The evaluation will also consider the manner in which the management functions interface with the quality control program. Additionally, the evaluation will consider the depth of quality of proposed key personnel from an experience, certifications, and education perspective. The evaluation will consider the sufficiency of the offeror's plans for transitioning the current Government workforce to a contractor operation, to include the Transition Plan (CDRL A020), schedules and milestones, initial transition, training, service management and quality control, organizational structure and management control, implementation of right of first refusal, out-year transitions, and contract termination transition. The government will assess the offeror's ability to acquire and maintain qualified staffing throughout the contract period. Additionally, each factor, sub-factor, and sub-sub-factor will receive a subjective rating based on confidence and risk. *Proposal Confidence* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated technical proposal. *Proposal Risk* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of an offeror's potential for *unsuccessful* contract performance.

(2) Resource Management (Sub-factor 2) - The Government will assess the offeror's ability to meet resource management requirements necessary to ensure successful performance of the requirements of the PRD and solicitation. The evaluation will consider each offeror's plan to manage labor, Government-furnished property, contract changes, and contract costs. The evaluation will also consider the adequacy and levels of management and supervision relating to resource management, to include assignment of responsibilities for supervision, applicable procedures, organizational staffing, reporting relationships, and proposed manning. Additionally, the evaluation will consider the offeror's plan to manage work scope adjustments for new, changed or emergency work requirements to include key program management personnel, personnel administration, manning levels in response to fluctuations, and methods proposed to measure and increase productivity. The evaluation will consider the adequacy and quality of each offeror's description of the methods and procedures to be employed in financial management, including accounting, cost management, estimating systems, budget development, budget analysis processes and corrective actions to control budget overrun/underrun pertaining to costs. Additionally, each factor, sub-factor, and sub-sub-factor will receive a subjective rating based on confidence and risk. *Proposal Confidence* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated technical proposal. *Proposal Risk* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of an offeror's potential for *unsuccessful* contract performance.

(3) Quality Control (Sub-factor 3) - The Government will assess the offeror's ability to meet quality control requirements necessary to ensure successful performance of the requirements of the PRD and solicitation. The evaluation will consider the adequacy and quality of each offeror's proposed inspection system, methods for identifying and preventing deficiencies, processes for implementing corrective actions, proposed complaint feedback system, Government personnel interfaces, and identification of inspection records. The evaluation will also consider the offeror's articulation in addressing the specific services outlined in Technical Exhibit 7 (Performance Summary of Quality Control Standards). Additionally, each factor, sub-factor, and sub-sub-factor will receive a subjective rating based on

confidence and risk. *Proposal Confidence* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated technical proposal. *Proposal Risk* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of an offeror's potential for **unsuccessful** contract performance.

(4) Subcontracting Plan (Sub-factor 4) – The Government will assess the large business offerors' ability to meet subcontracting requirements necessary to ensure successful performance of the requirements of PRD and solicitation. The evaluation will consider the adequacy and quality of each large business offeror's plan to comply with the statutory and contractual subcontracting requirements outlined in this solicitation (30% to small business), provide complete oversight of the subcontracting program, and sustain the quality of all subcontracting functions. The evaluation will also consider the offeror's efforts to broaden the small business vendor base, outreach programs, successes in establishing subcontracting goals, and the identification of separate percentages for utilization of small business concerns for the base contract period and the out-years. The evaluation will consider and give credit for plans the offeror may have to exceed the established subcontracting goals identified in Section L. Additionally, each factor, sub-factor, and sub-sub-factor will receive a subjective rating based on confidence and risk. *Proposal Confidence* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated technical proposal. *Proposal Risk* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of an offeror's potential for **unsuccessful** contract performance.

(5) Government-Furnished Property (Sub-factor 5) – The Government will assess the offeror's ability to meet Government-furnished property requirements of the PRD and solicitation. The evaluation will consider the adequacy and quality of each offeror's description of its plan outlining its policies, methods, and procedures to control, account for, maintain, use, and dispose of Government-furnished property in its possession in accordance with the requirements of the PRD. Additionally, each factor, sub-factor, and sub-sub-factor will receive a subjective rating based on confidence and risk. *Proposal Confidence* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated technical proposal. *Proposal Risk* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of an offeror's potential for **unsuccessful** contract performance.

(6) Emergency Situations and Contingency Operations Support (Sub-factor 6) – The Government will assess the offeror's ability to meet the Emergency Situations and Contingency Operations Support requirements of the PRD and solicitation, specifically in the Plans, Programs, Operations, and Mobilization functional area. The evaluation will consider the offeror's plan for supporting current, special, and emergency operations and for providing logistical support for the installation with regard to mobilization, deployment, contingency, and wartime missions. The evaluation will also consider the offeror's plan to provide immediate response to all Emergency Operations Center directed efforts in support of current, special, and emergency operations to ensure mission accomplishment and force survivability. The evaluation will also consider the offeror's ability to apply appropriate mandatory and advisory technical standards, resources, and priorities to fulfill product and service requirements, aiding the customer in defining and quantifying his expectations of satisfactory quality, and perform any rework necessary to yield a final product that ensures high customer satisfaction. Additionally, each factor, sub-factor, and sub-sub-factor will receive a subjective rating based on confidence and risk. *Proposal Confidence* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated technical proposal.

*Proposal Risk* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of an offeror's potential for **unsuccessful** contract performance.

**(c) Past & Present Performance** – The Government will assess the offeror's Past and Present Performance to ensure it is relevant to the requirements and intent of the PRD and solicitation. The evaluation will consider the offeror's relevant government contract experience depth, breadth, and quality. The evaluation will also consider the offeror's relevant civilian contract experience depth, breadth, and quality. The evaluation will consider the relevant experience of key personnel and identified subcontractors. Additionally, each factor, sub-factor, sub-sub-factor will receive a subjective rating based on confidence and risk. *Proposal Confidence* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of the probability of an offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated technical quality and management quality proposals. *Proposal Risk* represents the Government evaluation team's judgment of an offeror's potential for disruption in schedule, increased cost, degradation of performance and the need for increased Government oversight as well as the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. If an offeror, proposed subcontractor, or the proposed employee of an offeror, do not have a past performance history relevant to this solicitation, the offeror will receive a neutral rating for past performance. A favorable past performance rating may be considered more favorable than a neutral past performance rating. The absence of a relevant past performance record will not be justification for disqualifying any offeror.

**2) Price Proposal**--The Price Proposal evaluation will consider the specific elements of an offeror's total proposed cost and price to determine if the proposed elements are realistic for the work required in the PRD, materially balanced and accurate throughout the life of the contract, reflect a complete and clear understanding of the requirements, are reasonable, and are consistent with the methods of performance outlined in the offeror's technical quality and management quality proposals. **Any price proposal that is deemed to be substantially unreasonable, unrealistic, inaccurate, or incomplete will be considered technically unacceptable.** The government team will also assess the offeror's total price proposal to ensure the offeror has submitted all information required by the solicitation, the information tracks to the PRD, and the information supports the offer. As part of the evaluation, the team will determine whether the price proposal is fair and reasonable both to the offeror and the government, considering market conditions, technical and functional capabilities of the offeror and risk involved. Furthermore, the proposed indirect factor rate and its components should be commensurate with the level, quality, and difficulty of effort in performing the contract. The proposal should support performance motivation and cost savings.

Offers will be evaluated on the total proposed price impact of the proposed indirect factor rate and its components for the base period and each option period for the entire effort.

The Government will evaluate the price proposal for cost and price reasonableness, realism, accuracy, and completeness.

**Cost and price reasonableness** is defined as a price that does not exceed what would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business.

**Cost and price realism** measures whether the proposed price accurately reflects the offeror's proposed effort to meet solicitation requirements and objectives. The Government will utilize each offeror's technical submission in conducting realism analyses.

**Cost and price accuracy** relates to the offeror's attention to details in its submission to ensure correctness.

**Cost and price completeness** relates to the offeror's aggregate response to all solicitation requirements in totality of price.

An offeror's price proposal shall represent the offeror's best efforts to respond to the solicitation. Any inconsistency between promised performance and total proposed price shall be explained in the price proposal. For example, if a unique, innovative approach is the basis for an abnormally low cost estimate, the nature of

these approaches and their impact on the total proposed price must be explained. If an offeror proposes to absorb a portion of costs, the offeror must also explain the impact on the total proposed price. Any significant inconsistency, left unexplained will raise a fundamental question of the offeror's understanding of the nature and scope of work required and the offeror's ability to perform the contract within fiscal constraints and may render the proposal unacceptable. The threshold is met when the offeror's price proposal demonstrates a realistic cost and price for each function within the PRD and a total proposed price estimate that reflects a clear understanding of all of the service requirements for the transition period, base period, and each of the four (4) one-year option periods.

3) **Confidence and Risk Ratings.** *Under no circumstances will an offeror with a performance rating of no confidence/high risk be considered for award.* The Confidence and Risk Ratings and definitions are as follows:

Rating	Definition
High Risk	Likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased price, or degradation of performance. Risk may be unacceptable even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's proposed technical quality proposal, management quality proposal and/or past performance record, <i>extreme doubt</i> exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Regardless of the degree of government oversight or intervention, successful performance is doubtful.

#### **M.4. BASIS FOR AWARD**

In accordance with FAR Clause 52.215-1, titled "Instructions to Offerors—Competitive Acquisition" in Section L, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Accordingly, offerors are advised to submit initial proposals that are fully and clearly acceptable without additional information or explanation that contain the offeror's best terms. The Government may make a final determination as to whether an offeror's proposal is acceptable or unacceptable solely on the basis of the initial proposal. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines discussions to be necessary. Subject to the provisions of FAR 52.207-2, Notice of Cost Comparison, a single award will be made to the offeror whose proposal represents the Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable offer to the Government based on an integrated assessment of four factors: (1) Technical Quality, (2) Management Quality, (3) Past & Present Performance, and (4) Total Price.

Subject to the provisions of this solicitation, if performance under contract is determined to be more economical than Government performance, award will be made to that offeror whose proposal is determined to be the overall Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable offeror based upon the evaluation criteria stated in the solicitation, under the authority of OMB Circular A-76.

End of Section M